

There are a number of different things. Do you know how much energy we could save if people simply closed the refrigerator after they walked away from it, if people shut off the air conditioner when they were not going to be home?

A lot of us want to help get this country out of this problem. A lot of us in our hearts, we do not have it in our hearts to waste energy. We have it in our heart to be good citizens, and good citizens help conserve energy.

Let me just summarize it like this. I have had a number of constituents who have said to me, gosh, it is going to take a while for us to get electrical generation in place ready to go. It is going to take a while for us to find additional energy resources so that we can lessen our dependency on foreign oil. What can we do in the meantime?

Again, let me repeat to all of my colleagues, as we leave these Chambers, we can help immediately by turning out lights, by not changing that oil every 3,000 miles, by making sure that the direction of the ceiling fan is going as it should go.

I myself this morning, as I walked into my office, it is routine for me when I get to my office to turn on all the lights in my office. But for the first 2 hours I am in my own office in the morning, I sit at one location in my office; and I read newspapers. I only need one light. I do not need six lights. This morning in my office, I only had one light on, not six lights. The rest of my colleagues can do that as well.

So my contribution to these comments this afternoon is let us all contribute today to conservation. That is exactly what the Republican plan calls for. That is exactly what our President and our Vice President have said.

Again, we need two elements to lessen our dependency on foreign oil. We need to look for other energy resources. There is no question about it. We need to do it in an environmentally clean and safe manner. But we also need to conserve. If we combine those two elements, this country will, I think in a modest period of time, fairly quickly move out of this energy crisis, and we will be secure with energy for the future generations. That is what is critical.

ENERGY SHORTAGE MAY BE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM FACED IN YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 31 minutes, the remainder of the leadership hour.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the problem facing this country, an energy shortage, may be the most serious problem we have faced in years. The California brownouts are

only a symptom of a huge energy shortage that is prevalent in this country.

Ten dollar oil and a dollar per gallon gas lulled this country into a comfort zone that all is well with energy availability.

The Clinton-Gore administration, unfortunately, had no energy policy. The Clinton-Gore administration sold that conservation, and conservation is appropriate, and renewables would gradually replace fossil fuels. Yet, they supported new difficult regulations that made it almost impossible to realize this hydro, the most prevalent of renewables.

The Clinton-Gore administration sold that conservation renewables would gradually replace fossil fuels. Yet their regulations and policies did not support the relicensing of hydro, the most prevalent renewable source. They certainly did not propose the renewal or to make it easy to renew the operating license of existing safe nuclear plants. In fact, in reality, the Clinton-Gore administration started phasing out fossil fuel production before there was a replacement available.

So today we have a shortage of almost all kinds of energy. When one looks at how we make electricity today, 52 percent of our electricity comes from coal; 20 percent comes from nuclear, but most of those plants need to be relicensed and many felt it would be unable to relicense them in the last administration; 7 percent comes from hydro, and many feel it is going to be very difficult under the last administration's rules and regulations to relicense hydro, the most available renewable energy we have and the cleanest. Natural gas currently powers 16 percent of electric generation; oil, 3 percent; other renewables, 2 percent.

Now, we need to continue on the other renewables. We need to continue with solar and wind and geothermal. But if we double it, it will only produce 4 percent of our electricity. If we triple it, it will only produce 6 percent of our electricity.

□ 1630

In the next 20 years America's demand for oil will increase by 33 percent according to the Energy Information Institute. We are increasingly dependent, as we have already heard, on foreign governments for our oil. Back in 1973, when we were in crisis, we imported just 36 percent of our oil from overseas. Today we are somewhere between 58 and 60 percent. The number of U.S. refineries has been cut in half since 1980. A few have expanded, but no new ones have been built.

Then we come to natural gas. Consumer prices for natural gas have spiked this year. Home heating costs have doubled. I know industries who use a lot of gas who had their rates double, triple, and quadruple. Amer-

ica's demand for natural gas is expected to rise even more dramatically than oil. According to the Department of Energy, by the year 2020 we will consume 62 percent more natural gas than we do today.

In fact, one of my fears, one of my personal fears that I have been observing for the last couple of years is the amount of gas we have allocated to generation, because it is the quickest to build and it is the cleanest fuel we can burn to make electricity. The amount we have allocated to generation is greater than the amount that is being predicted to come into the system.

What happens when we use more than we have? The prices are going to escalate. It is the one fuel that worries me because it is what most American seniors use to heat their homes. It is what most American businesses have as the fuel that runs their business. Our hospitals and our schools and our universities, most of them use natural gas. If natural gas prices spike excessively again this year, we will have a huge heavy load placed on business, we will harm the economy, and we will force seniors to not be able to live in their homes.

Right now an estimated 40 percent of potential gas supplies in the United States are on Federal lands that are either closed to exploration or limited by severe restrictions. When we look at the map, the whole California coastline is closed, the whole eastern coastline of this country is closed, all of the area around Florida is closed; and yet other countries drill all around their shorelines and use natural gas as their heat. I guess Norway is one of the best at it.

Even if we find supplies of gas, moving it to market will require an additional 38,000 miles of pipeline and 255,000 miles of transmission line at huge costs.

Electricity, hydroelectric power generation, as I said earlier, is expected to fall sharply because of relicensing. Coal has historically been America's one source for affordable electricity. It currently powers half of America's electricity generators. Our Nation has enough coal to keep those plants running for 250 years. In fact, we have 40 percent of the world's coal, and we have 2 percent of the world's oil. It seems to me that coal should not be in a phase-out mode, as it has been with the past administration. We must use clean coal technologies to ensure this country's future for energy in the future.

Coal generators have already been required to make broad reductions in emissions. The Bush administration supports these efforts and will back it up with greater incentives for investments in clean coal technology. President Bush made the right decision not to impose new Federal mandates on the emissions of carbon dioxide. That is

the same gas we breathe out when we breathe. There are those who have criticized him for that. If he had allowed those regulations to come into place, coal use in this country would have come to a screeching stop because there is no replacement for it.

If America is to continue to have reliable electricity over the next 20 years, coal must play a continued role. If coal does not play a major role, from my point of view, this country will have very high energy prices and this country will face an economic recession. Nuclear power and hydroelectric face uncertain futures due to past policies. Hopefully, they will not under this new administration.

I am encouraged by the recommendation of the energy plan to increase our domestic energy supply by utilizing our public lands in a reasonable manner. Our Nation's public lands could and should play a role in sustainable energy policy. Thanks to so many new incredible developments in energy research, exploration and technology over the last 20 years, we can confidently explore for oil and gas and coal on our public lands in an environmentally-sound manner without leaving anything other than a small footprint.

The Federal Government owns one-third of this country; yet there are those who are opposed to use of public lands for energy production. One-third of America is owned by the Federal Government, and when we add State and local governments, somewhere between 45 and 50 percent of this country is owned by government. If all that land is going to be locked up to resource use, this country does not have an economic future.

Yes, ANWR is one of the areas where there is lots of discussion. The Energy Department says the coastal plain of ANWR is the largest unexplored potentially productive onshore basin for oil and gas in the United States. ANWR could contain enough oil to offset all Iraq imports for the next 46 years. Oil production in Alaska's Arctic occurs under the world's best environmental standards. Many of the countries we rely on for oil have little or no environmental regulations.

Oil development is strongly supported by the Eskimo people who actually live on the north slope of Alaska and by 75 percent of all Alaskans. Exploration would be done using 21st century technology, supercomputers, ice roads that melt in the spring, and directional drilling. Only 3 square miles of the coastal plain of the 30,600 square miles of ANWR would be affected. Only 3 square miles. That would leave 30,597 square miles untouched.

I certainly think for the future of this country, having a strong energy source, and none of these are a silver bullet, none of these solve the problem; but we need them all. It is the equivalent

of building an airport one-fifth the size of Dulles in the State of South Carolina. The caribou herd in and near the Prudhoe Bay oil field is five times larger than when development began. All other wildlife species are healthy, no endangered species. Contrary to the myth the environmental extremists created, there is no north slope oil being exported. None has been since May 2000. When it was exported, no more than 5 percent was sold abroad. This is less than exported by the West Coast of the United States.

We barely think about the plight of the American farmer, but agriculture is paying huge costs because of energy. The cost of fertilizer has risen. In fact, some fertilizer plants have actually gone out of business. Some fertilizer plants sold their gas this year because they could make more money in selling the gas than producing the fertilizer.

We have not built a refinery in this country since 1976. In fact, 36 U.S. refineries have closed since 1992. We have not built a nuclear reactor in 20 years. California has not built a power plant of any sort in 10 years. According to Edison Electric Institute, our investment in our electricity infrastructure has dropped 15 percent since 1990; yet use of that system has jumped 400 percent in just the last 4 years. Most of the new plants built in this country are being fueled by natural gas, but we need to have the natural gas to run them.

The future of America depends on an energy policy. I have strong faith in the Bush administration and their proposal to take us where we need to be. There should be debate. Conservation should lead the road. We all need to get into the conservation business. We must use our energy wisely, but we must have a strong source of energy so that we have choices and people have options.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

ENERGY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for the remainder of the leadership hour, 21 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I am obviously from California, and I would like to talk about some of the problems that we have in California. They are obviously well publicized. Some of the things people talk about are true, and certainly some things are not true.

First, I would like to congratulate my home State of California. No State uses less electricity per capita than the people in the State of California. I think many people may find that as a surprise, but that is the truth. No State uses less electricity per capita than the State of California.

No State uses more renewable energy than any State other than California.

California has been a leader on wind. Right in my own county, Riverside County, in the Banning Pass, if any of my colleagues have been to Palm Springs, they can drive down the I-10 freeway and see row upon row upon row of wind machines that supply needed peaking electricity to Southern California.

No State uses more solar power than the State of California. We have really invested a significant amount of money in California into solar research and the utilization of solar power.

No State uses more geothermal than the State of California. Really, the geothermal industry started in Imperial County, California. If my colleagues go down into Imperial County near the Salton Sea in the beautiful State of California, they can see these huge geothermal plants that were developed to produce electricity.

All of that in California. People in California doing the best they can to conserve electricity, to use renewable energy in California. But today we know that that is still not enough.

Now, there have been reports that California has not built a power plant in 10 years. That is not true. I do not want to correct some of my friends, but we have built power plants in California in the last 10 years. Not large power plants. Certainly there have been power plants built outside of California that import power into California.

I congratulate Los Angeles, the Department of Water and Power, who gets a significant amount of their electricity, the City of Los Angeles, a significant amount of their electricity from the State of Utah using coal, the clean coal that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) talked about. And I congratulate Mayor Riordan who now is in negotiation with the people in Utah to develop additional plants, one plant that was discussed as large as 3,500 megawatts in the State of Utah, to transmit power into Los Angeles for future demand. That is necessary along with plants being built in California.

Certainly natural gas has been talked about. It is the preferred fuel source in California. But we have a problem in California, in not being able to get enough gas into the State of California because of all of these gas turbine plants that are being built. There have been a lot built of late and a lot more coming online. And we are happy to have them, but we do not have enough natural gas distribution coming into the State of California, which is adding to the increased price of natural gas within our State. So we have an infrastructure problem, not just with gas pipelines coming into California, but with the infrastructure around refineries. Refineries have been talked about. We have far less refining capability in California than we used to have.